Case 2:22-cv-01708-KJM-EFB Documer	nt 22 F	Filed 08/28/23	Page 1 of 2	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
DUANE ANGELO GITTENS,	No.	2:22-cv-01708-	KJM-EFB (HC)	
Petitioner,				
V.	<u>ORI</u>	<u>DER</u>		
UNKNOWN,				
Respondent.				
Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a "petition [to] the court to file [an]				
original bill of lading." ECF No. 1. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judg				
as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.				
On June 9, 2023, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were				
served on petitioner and which contained notice to petitioner that any objections to the findings				
and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Petitioner has since filed several				
documents, which, in an abundance of caution, the court construes as objections to the findings				
4 and recommendations.				
In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this				S
court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having reviewed the file, the court finds the				e
findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis. The				
	UNITED STATE FOR THE EASTERN I DUANE ANGELO GITTENS, Petitioner, v. UNKNOWN, Respondent. Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding original bill of lading." ECF No. 1. The matter as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and I On June 9, 2023, the magistrate judge served on petitioner and which contained notice and recommendations were to be filed within a documents, which, in an abundance of caution and recommendations. In accordance with the provisions of 25 court has conducted a de novo review of this contained and recommendations.	UNITED STATES DIST FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICE DUANE ANGELO GITTENS, Petitioner, V. UNKNOWN, Respondent. Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se original bill of lading." ECF No. 1. The matter was r as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Respondent on June 9, 2023, the magistrate judge filed fin served on petitioner and which contained notice to pet and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen documents, which, in an abundance of caution, the contained notice to pet and recommendations. In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. court has conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this case. Has	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFOR DUANE ANGELO GITTENS, Petitioner, V. UNKNOWN, Respondent. Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a "petition original bill of lading." ECF No. 1. The matter was referred to a Unit as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On June 9, 2023, the magistrate judge filed findings and recomserved on petitioner and which contained notice to petitioner that any and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Petitione documents, which, in an abundance of caution, the court construes as and recommendations. In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) court has conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this case. Having reviewed the	DUANE ANGELO GITTENS, Petitioner, V. UNKNOWN, Respondent. Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a "petition [to] the court to file [an] original bill of lading." ECF No. 1. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Jud as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On June 9, 2023, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on petitioner and which contained notice to petitioner that any objections to the finding and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Petitioner has since filed several documents, which, in an abundance of caution, the court construes as objections to the finding and recommendations. In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this court has conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this case. Having reviewed the file, the court finds the

court has reviewed petitioner's objections and has been unable to discern what the basis of

petitioner's objections are. From both the petition and the objections, it is unclear what relief petitioner seeks, if any. See F. & R. at 2, ECF No. 19. Additionally, the court cannot discern the basis of this court's jurisdiction. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The findings and recommendations filed June 9, 2023, are adopted in full; and 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice to the filing of a civil complaint alleging breach of contract. DATED: August 26, 2023.

Case 2:22-cv-01708-KJM-EFB Document 22 Filed 08/28/23 Page 2 of 2